DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 161 069 CS 204 459

AUTHOR Detweiler, John S.; Anderson, James W.
TITLE Comparing Public Relations' Lifestyles in a Campaigns Course.
PUB DATE Aug 78
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism (61st, Seattle, Washington, August 13-16, 1978); Not available in hard copy due to marginal reproducibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Class Organization; Communication Skills; *Grouping (Instructional Purposes); Group Instruction; Group Structure; Higher Education; Interaction; Organizational Communication; *Public Relations; *Small Group Instruction; Teaching Techniques

ABSTRACT

Two public relations campaigns courses designed to provide senior students with practical public relations skills were organized in different ways. One class, employing small four- or five-member teams, implemented short-term projects that consisted of planning and implementing a campaign during the nine-week term. In the other class, students were organized into a 22-member public relations counseling firm and undertook the planning of a comprehensive communications program for an energy research and education park. While this class did not implement its campaign, the course ended with a full-dress presentation to the client group and other university officials. Responses to evaluative questionnaires by students in both classes indicated that there were no significant differences between the courses in instructor performance, student satisfaction, common assignments, and general public relations career preparation. However, students in the small-group, campaign-implementation class expressed superior assessments of their preparation in the use of media. Although time pressure was assessed as a negative factor, the comparison of the two courses implies that students benefit more from the small group approach. (Author/MAI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED161069

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Public Relations Division

COMPARING PUBLIC RELATIONS' LIFESTYLES IN A CAMPAIGNS COURSE

By

John S. Detweiler
Associate Professor
(904) 392-0453

and

James W. Anderson
Associate Professor
(904) 392-0427

Department of Public Relations and Advertising
College of Journalism and Communications
234 Stadium, University of Florida
Gainesville, FL 32611

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John S. Detweiler
James W. Anderson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Presented to the Public Relations Division
Association for Education in Journalism
Annual Convention, Seattle, Wash., August 1978

CS204457

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

COMPARING PUBLIC RELATIONS' LIFESTYLES IN A CAMPAIGNS COURSE

By John S. Detweiler and James W. Anderson

Public Relations Division
Association for Education in Journalism

The campaigns class in public relations is designed to give advanced students practical experience in exercising the principles and professional techniques which they have encountered in one or more basic courses. It can also be orientation into a professional lifestyle.

Most such courses seek to involve students in quite similar experiences: Fact finding, problem identification, goal setting, planning, implementing a communications program and evaluation. However, there are different ways in which students may experience these processes or perceive the importance attached to each. These differences may shape student perceptions of what public relations is all about. Or, if the student already has a preconceived notion of what public relations is like from earlier course work, these differences may affect student attitudes on whether or not a particular experience is relevant to a career in public relations.

This study seeks to explore the difference in student perceptions of two contrasting methods of teaching the campaigns course. It seeks to determine if certain visceral experiences related to the pace and the implementation of a public relations campaign, which are quite different in two generally accepted approaches to the campaigns course, will shape student perceptions about the effectiveness of the instruction.

The study does not address itself to the issue, however, of which associated lifestyle is more appropriate for a career in public relations. It is quite possible that the value attached by students to their present experiences will be altered considerably when they are placed into future career roles.

"Small-Group, Campaign-Implementation" Approach

One method of teaching public relations campaigning is through what we shall call the "Small-Group, Campaign-Implementation" approach. For brevity's sake it will hereafter be referred to as the "small-group" approach. Any solitary PR practitioner or small working group will recognize the lifestyle. Deadlines loom almost instantaneously, and fact finding, goal setting and planning somehow proceed apace with implementation. Objectives tend to be short-term, and the old "putting out fires" cliche frequently applies.

In the campaigns course, this type of lifestyle is associated with the appointment of small working teams--four or five members--and requiring them to choose a client, plan a campaign and implement it within the term. The pace is particularly frenetic under the quarter system, where there are typically nine weeks of class time.

In such small teams there is not a great deal of opportunity for specialization. Team members function principally as generalists, although each person will have some specific responsibilities. The projects themselves tend to be small in scope, or at least tightly packed. Client cooperation is mandated, real media are used, and successes and failures are toted up in terms of tangible behavior on the part of selected audiences. Public acceptance of the communications messages is the goal rather than client acceptance.

"Large-Group, Campaign Presentation" Approach

A second method of teaching public relations campaigning is through what we shall term the "Large-Group, Campaign-Presentation" approach, hereafter called the "large group" approach. The lifestyle of this approach is more closely akin to that encountered in a large public relations department or agency.

The projects undertaken tend to be broader, more long-range, and more temperately paced. Of particular importance in the campaigns course is not only the size and complexity of the action group but the calendar followed. Today is devoted to preparation; actual implementation lies in the future and will probably be done by someone else. In the presentations approach, a large group of practitioners are assembling a campaign that has as its initial objective the winning of the acceptance of the client.

In a 20-member organization there is a great deal more attention given to specialization. A formal table of organization is established, and leadership roles are clearly defined.

Because the campaign does not actually proceed through the implementation stage, it provides no such feedback as clippings in print (or the lack thereof), no pride in hearing "my" announcement on the radio or over the public address system, no evidence that the messages so thoroughly prepared will actually yield the expected results.

To more sharply delineate the differences between these two approaches, they are discussed below in matched listings of advantages and disadvantages.

Small-Group Approach

The advantages of the small-group approach are as follows:

(1) More responsibility is placed upon each student in the

functioning of the campaign. With small numbers involved, it is easier for the instructor and the students to pinpoint effective performance.

(2) Students choose their own clients, working on projects which they themselves have identified as meaningful and interesting. This might enhance their general motivation.

(3) A short-term campaign in which students seek to accomplish specific objectives enables them to make actual use of various communications media. Students find out through personal experience what the media will use and what they won't.

(4) Beyond their own team activity, students are exposed in class to project reports from other teams. They learn how their colleagues encounter far different problems and how they go about overcoming them. Such presentations serve to enhance their general knowledge about the practice of public relations.

(5) Students have regular interaction with the client while the campaign is in progress, experiencing some of the satisfactions and difficulties of working with "management."

Some of the perceived disadvantages of the small-group approach are as follows:

(1) Because the project must be planned and implemented in a nine-week period, there is a minimum amount of time for preparation. This may lead to superficial action and an impulsive approach to public relations objectives.

(2) There is likely to be unevenness in the educational experiences encountered by different teams. While the instructor intervenes at times to limit the grandiose plans of one group or expand the vision of another, some projects just lend themselves to a fuller range of public relations skills than do others.

(3) The limitations of time and budget virtually eliminate the use of certain important media or activities. These limitations force reliance upon such fast-response media as radio, daily newspapers and posters or fliers.

Large-Group Approach

Some of the advantages of working as a member of a large-group class are as follows:

(1) Much more attention is given to the fact finding, goal setting and programming functions of public relations. Numerous alternatives are explored before each course of action is chosen.

(2) Much more comprehensive projects may be undertaken. While each individual in the class may perform a relatively limited function, the total class effort will closely approach the magnitude of a large-scale public relations effort.

(3) Greater attention is given to integrating the various communications processes, providing conceptual training in what it means to have a harmonious "corporate identity."

(4) The general atmosphere of the final team presentation has an air of importance not found in the classroom presentations of the small groups. Members of the client group and other interested parties are likely to attend.

(5) The complexity of the organization involved may create certain internal pressures and evoke certain internal conflicts which are part of a realistic public relations learning experience. The value of good leadership may be demonstrated.

Some of the disadvantages of working as a member of a large-group class are as follows:

(1) Individual students, particularly if they are not in management positions, may be confined to rather narrow functions in the

campaign which restrict full development of their PR abilities. Similarly, in the area of motivation, it is possible that a student sensing he is 1/22 of a team may not feel the dedication that a student who is 1/4 or 1/5 of a team might have.

(2) Since the campaign in this type of experience is not actually implemented, the students lack direct exposure to such important facets of public relations training as actual usage of the mass media or any feedback on the effectiveness of the team's plans and processes.

(3) Students are less likely to end up with certain tangible benefits from the campaign such as clippings, photos of actual events as they take place, and individual letters of recommendation from a client with whom he or she worked rather closely. All of these may prove useful in interviews with future employers.

There is an additional lifestyle quite appropriate to a public relations campaigns course which is something of a blend of the two used in this study. It is formation of small teams to prepare competing campaign presentations for a single client, with final grades resting largely upon the client's preferences. This approach is frequently used in advertising campaigns courses at the University of Florida.

Course Characteristics in Comparison

During the Winter Quarter 1978 there were two sections of PR 415, Advanced Public Relations, offered at the University of Florida. As luck would have it, when registration and the normal attrition process were completed the two courses ended up equal in size. One course employed the large-group class approach and the other the small-group approach to the campaigns portion of the course. In other ways they were quite similar, following essentially

the same course outline. They used the same textbook and required the students to complete a similar array of assignments and examinations.

Small-Group Approach

In the class using the small-group approach, teams were chosen randomly at the beginning of the second week of class. There were three teams of four members each and two teams of five members each, for a total of 22 students. Within one week after the teams had been formed, each was to choose a client and report back to class with a general outline of what it hoped to accomplish. By the fifth week, teams were required to present a well-defined outline of their campaign, including measurable objectives.

Each team projected from 20 to 30 objectives, ranging from activities totally under their control such as "writing and distributing five public service announcements" to bottom-line objectives such as "raising $3,000 in pledges" for Multiple Sclerosis. By the eighth and ninth weeks the students were expected to present hour-long presentations to the class on their accomplishments. These oral reports were supplemented by booklets delineating the team's processes and accomplishments, substantiated by appropriate exhibits. Each oral presentation was accompanied by a slide presentation.

After their formation, each team was left largely on its own. Leadership was expected to emerge rather than be officially designated. Sometimes the teams knitted together closely into harmonious working groups, and sometimes rivalries, lack of commitments or inept leadership methods hampered full participation.

With one exception, clients were largely nonprofit type organizations which have ready access to free publicity. These included an Older American's Council, Department of Health and

Rehabilitative Services, International Student Association and Multiple Sclerosis. One team, however, participated in the opening of a shopping mall and was allocated $15,000 for advertising and entertainment.

Each team was assigned a project grade. Then, based on reports which the students prepared on their own contributions to the campaign, an evaluation by the instructor of their work products, and the instructor's general assessment of their participation, each student was assigned a grade. The average of team members' grades must equal the team grade. In some cases, individual grades exceeded 100 when one student made a dominant contribution to an effective team effort. Grades ranged from 100+ to "C", with most of them falling in the "B" range.

Large-Group Approach

The 22 class members in the large-group section began by forming into a public relations counseling firm, STAR Communications. By the second week the students elected officers in the agency and the instructor took on the role of an elderly chairman of the board preparing for retirement.

The client was assigned, Energy Research and Education Park (EREP). It was a new unit within the University of Florida designed to focus the university's efforts in researching and promoting alternative forms of energy to fossil fuels, nuclear energy and hydro-electric power.

Approximately one-half of the quarter was devoted to fact finding and problem definition. The class interviewed 25 principals in EREP. Because of the university's reputation in the field of solar energy, the collection of scientists and engineers were already deluged with 400 letters a week and 200 visitors a month. Part of the team's task

was to expedite handling of these inquiries and to formulate plans for exhibiting alternative forms of energy to key publics.

Each team member was assigned to a planning task force, following largely individual preferences. The task forces included advertising, lobbying, open house, energy week and poster contest, speakers' bureau, graphic identity, brochures, media, phone and mailing lists, and permanent exhibits. As the class moved from the planning to the implementation stage, these task forces were dissolved and execution teams were formed. These included art, writing-editing, presentation, audio-visual and informational services.

During the period of time when the 22-member team was outlining its specific communications activities, there were heated discussions among strong-willed members of the class. Once the execution teams were performing their functions, the class made one final selection: which class members would preside at the final presentation to the client. The presentation team was elected by the class, based largely upon the ability they showed in presenting case studies earlier in the term.

There was a trial-run presentation in class and then a full-dress presentation to the 25-member client group, plus other university officials and guests. The presentation was carried off with a good deal of polish and was well received by the EREP representatives. After it was over, the client group indicated it would employ two public relations students as interns over the next 36 months to begin implementation of the campaign.

Grades were assigned by the instructor based upon his observations

of student performance during the term and on the basis of work products compiled in a booklet for his use. Most of the campaign grades were in the "A" range, from 90 to 98.

Evaluation Instruments Used

To test the assumption that there were no significant differences between these two modes of instruction in meeting general public relations training objectives, the study employed two questionnaires at the end of the term. Each sought slightly different reactions from the students; one was a general course evaluation instrument used by the University of Florida and one was specifically designed for these two classes in Advanced Public Relations.

The 21-item University of Florida questionnaire provided responses on the instructor's performance as a teacher, the students' interest in the course, student-instructor interaction, the level of course demands, and general course organization. This instrument was distributed to both classes during the last class period of the eighth week of class. In both classes, there were 17 students present on that class date.

The second instrument was a 33-item questionnaire designed by the authors specificially for comparing the students' perceptions of the Advanced Public Relations course they were just completing. It was administered during the first class period of the ninth and final week of class. In both instances, 21 students were present.

Both questionnaires used a five-point scale in eliciting student responses. All 21 items on the general questionnaire were keyed to responses of "Strongly Agree," "Agree," "Neither Agree nor Disagree," "Disagree," or "Strongly Disagree." The public relations questionnaire had 11 items which followed the same format. It had 22 additional items which utilized the following five-point

scale: "Excellent Preparation," "Fair Preparation," "Neutral," "Inadequate Preparation," and "Virtually No Preparation." The latter questions were based on the degree to which the student believed the course prepared him or her for a career in public relations.

There were some questions on portions of the course in which the course content was essentially the same. There were some questions on the campaign in which the instructors felt that both modes of instruction had accomplished the same objective. And there were some questions which should apply more appropriately to one mode of instruction. Some questions drew direct comparisons between the two modes of instruction and sought the students' preferences.

Analysis of Questionnaire Data

There was an attempt to analyze each question to determine if it evoked significant differences in student responses, but in only two instances were such differences established. One instance showed that those who participated in the small-group method of instruction had a much more pronounced desire for that type of instruction. Another found that more members of the small-group class felt they had received good preparation in making audio-visual presentations. In order to increase the cell size in this portion of the evaluation, the five categories were collapsed to three.

Instructor Performance Variables

Certain items on the general and public relations questionnaires bore directly on the students' evaluation of the instructor's teaching methods. If student responses were found to vary significantly according to the instructor, then this factor could influence all other responses. In this study, there was no such difference between

the two classes' perceptions of their instructor's attitude or effectiveness. ("G" refers to the general questionnaire employed in all University of Florida teacher evaluations. "PR" refers to the special public relations questionnaire.)

The following data are a summation of responses to the following questions on the two questionnaires:

(G-1) "The instructor was enthusiastic when presenting course material."

(G-2) "The instructor seemed interested in teaching."

(G-3) "The instructor used examples to get his point across in class."

(G-4) "The instructor seemed concerned if the students learned the material."

(G-9) "The instructor encouraged students to express their opinions."

(G-10) "The instructor was receptive to new ideas and other's viewpoints."

(PR-14) "How did I find the role of the professor to be in helping me learn what I need to know to function as a PR practitioner." ("Most helpful"-"No Help at All" continuum.)

Group Size	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Small	39	48	36	13	4	140
Large	34	46	33	16	11	140
	73	94	69	29	15	280

$X^2 = 4.10$, N.S.

General Student Satisfaction

Certain items on the general and public relations questionnaires dealt directly with the students' perceptions of their own actions and attitudes regarding the course. If these attitudes were markedly dissimilar in the two classes, it might indicate that there were factors in the course, which might or might not involve the teaching

method used in the campaigns portion of the course, which evoked student satisfaction.

(G-5) "The student was interested in learning the course material."

(G-6) "The student was generally attentive in class."

(G-7) "The student felt the course was a intellectual challenge."

(G-11) "The student had an opportunity to ask questions."

(PR-6) "I was totally frustrated by this course." (Scoring reversed to match positive questions.)

Group Size	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Small	34	22	10	4	2	72
Large	21	24	13	8	6	72
	55	46	23	12	8	144

$X^2 = 3.5$[redacted].

Specific Student Satisfaction

Three questions bore directly upon the students' perceptions of the small-team vs. large-team concept, including one in which students were given an opportunity to reject either team concept in favor of an individual campaign project. As indicated earlier, such questions tended to indicate general student satisfaction with the type of campaign organization which they had just experienced.

Two other questions dealt with the concept of "ownership" in the campaign--"I was not assigned an important role in carrying out a PR campaign" and "My ideas were not accepted in planning and implementing the PR campaign." Responses indicated that the small-group approach is not inherently superior in terms of securing a feeling of student involvement and acceptance. Those in the large group felt approximately the same degree of "ownership" in their campaign as those who were in the small group.

Three other factors in the two classes were virtually identical. Among these were the textbook, Allen Center's Public Relations Practices: Case Studies; writing and marketing a hometown news release, and planning and executing a special event. Presentation of an oral case study was also common to both courses, but it was handled differently by the instructors. There were no significant differences in the way in which the students from the two sections perceived the common aspects of their courses.

PR Career Preparation

A number of questions were designed to determine the degree to which the practically-oriented campaigns course seemed to prepare the students for a career in public relations. This was the most important part of the evaluative process. The assumption that the contrasting teaching styles would not be significantly different in terms of student perceptions was borne out. Both teaching methods were viewed as good preparation for a career in public relations; while those students in the small-group class expressed their views more strongly, the difference did not meet the statistical test of significance.

These questions were as follows:

(PR-18) "How do I evaluate the following assignments as preparation for a PR practitioner--team effort for client."

(PR-1) "PR 415 was helpful to me in understanding how to define a problem, set goals and objectives, and select a means to attain these objectives."

(PR-2) "PR 415 failed to expand my knowledge and understanding of basic PR principles." (Responses reversed to conform to a positive question.)

(PR-3) "PR 415 was helpful to me in understanding the value of assigning responsibilities and setting up a time-table for work to be done."

(PR-4) "PR 415 helped me to sharpen practical skills useful to the PR professional."

(PR-10) "I do not believe that this course added to my understanding of how effective communication can help achieve success in meeting an objective." (Responses reversed to conform to a positive question.)

(G-8) "The student became more competent in this area due to the course."

Group Size	Excel. Prep.	Fair Prep.	Neutral	Inadq. Prep.	Virtually No Prep.	Total
Small	80	41	13	7	2	143
Large	48	65	18	9	2	142
	128	106	31	16	4	285

$X^2 = 10.98$, N.S.

Media Usage Preparation

There was a series of items in the public relations questionnaire which pertained directly to the value of the course in working with various forms of communications media. This was the only area of the course in which there was a significant difference found between the two approaches in the campaigns part of the course. In the small-group class, students had actually experienced working with a number of the media. Furthermore, the diffusion of work into five teams required more of them to engage in such experiences.

As a result, students in the small-group class tended to rate their preparation for future usage of communications media higher than their counterparts in the large-group class. The media in which the small-group class felt better prepared included: Audio-visual presentations, speaking before groups, use of electronic media, use of posters and fliers, preparing presentation booklet, and planning oral presentation. The only item in which the large-group class expressed more confidence in their preparation than the small-group class was use of publications (booklets, magazines).

The summation of the scores for this category was as follows:

"To what degree did I find PR 415 helped me to work with the following channels of communication:

(PR-20) "--audio-visual presentations"

(PR-21) "--use of print news media"

(PR-22) "--speaking before groups"

(PR-23) "--use of electronic media"

(PR-24) "--use of posters, fliers"

(PR-25) "--use of face-to-face contact"

(PR-26) "--preparing presentation booklet"

(PR-27) "--use of direct mail"

(PR-28) "--use of publications (booklets, magazines)"

(PR-29) "--planning oral presentation"

Group Size	Excel. Prep.	Fair Prep.	Neutral	Inadq. Prep.	Virtually No. Prep.	Total
Small	81	90	36	12	6	205
Large	44	72	52	19	23	210
	125	142	88	31	29	415

X^2 = 25.40, significant at the .01 level

Summary and Conclusions

In only one area did there prove to be a significant difference between the two approaches in the campaigns course, and that area dealt with student perceptions of their preparation for usage of various media.

While it seems obvious that such a difference should occur in contrasting a course in which students actually put media to work to accomplish campaign objectives with one in which no implementation of the campaign objectives was undertaken, the difference is actually linked as closely to group size as to campaign style.

Those participating in the small-group class expressed greater confidence in their preparation for several types of media used only internally in both classes rather than in implementation of campaign

objectives. Among these are: Audio-visual presentation, preparing presentation booklet, planning oral presentations and to a lesser extent, speaking before groups. (Some members of the small-group class made numerous oral presentations to groups as part of their campaign promotion.)

Both the objective questionnaire responses and the open-ended comments furnished by the students point to certain advantages in both the small group and campaign implementation approaches coupled in the small-group class. It appeared that it was easier for the student to get a handle on the public relations activity required, not only because the campaigns proceeded through the implementation stage but also because there is more obvious work to go around in a number of small team projects.

Comments of students in the small-group class reinforce some of the advantages and disadvantages of the approach discussed earlier. Lack of time or too much pressure upon available time were the predominant drawbacks in the experience which the students mentioned. Among such comments were: "Too many small projects (other than campaign) took up team project time." "The amount of outside time needed caused me to neglect other courses." "Time--Good to learn how busy you can get."

The overall reaction to the campaign experience was decidedly postive, however. In assessing the course's effectiveness in preparing them for a career in public relations, students commented: "I strongly feel that in this course you have all the aspects of PR which you will use when you get in the field. I feel it was very helpful." (Good preparation)"To a great degree. It was fun and exciting work." "It was excellent preparation for the future--my only wish is that there were another course that did it in more detail."

Next to time pressures, the unreliability of certain team members and the uncooperative nature of certain clients were commonly mentioned as drawbacks.

For the large-group class, the principal drawback was lack of organization. Perhaps the agency's executives were elected too early in the process. There is a possibility that the students perceptions of the course would improve under more able leadership. It was obvious from comments that disorganization reigned and that the team encountered sharp interpersonal conflicts as it shifted from the relatively benign planning stage into the implementation stage.

Some of the remarks were: "I can't stand disorganization." "The confusion--bad organization." "A whole class team is unweildy." "I think the interpersonal conflicts were interesting. That was a difficulty--but dealing with sometimes competing strong personalities was good training." "Disorganization toward the end of the quarter, but we learned to put everything together and stage a successful presentation."

While there were some remarks about the slowness of the preparation process, the general observations were favorable: "It made me aware of the amount of time it takes to plan and implement an important PR project." "This was the most realistic course I've had at the University. I really learned a lot!" "I enjoyed the class immensely, much more than the typical public relations class I have taken in the past. By working 'in the field' I was offered an opportunity to deal with actual PR practices and problems."

For instructors of public relations campaigns courses, the data show that both approaches are good, but in some respects the

small-group, campaign-implementation approach is better. At least, from the perspective of students when they are evaluating their experience with communications media both inside and outside of the classroom context.

The small-group approach is very effective at quickly thrusting students into real-life practical experiences. Student reactions indicate this is exactly the type of training that they are seeking. But can this premise be carried too far? Certainly, a "the more work the better" philosophy may sacrifice some of the contemplative aspects of the modern PR public relations practitioner. After all, modern professionals use this very criterion, think-before-action, to distinguish themselves from their shoot-from-the-hip predecessors.

General Questionnaire

For each statement, make the appropriate mark (a) if you strongly agree with the statement (b) if you agree with the statement (c) if you neither agree or disagree with the statement (d) if you disagree with the statement (e) if you strongly disagree with the statement. (note: SG = "small-group" class: LG = "large-group" class.)

Item		A	B	C	D	E	Tot
1. The instructor was enthusiastic when presenting course material.	SG	5	10	2	0	0	17
	LG	7	7	2	1	0	17
2. The instructor seemed to be interested in teaching.	SG	7	6	4	0	0	17
	LG	8	6	2	1	0	17
3. The instructor used examples to get his point across in class.	SG	5	8	1	0	3	17
	LG	5	3	6	1	2	17
4. The instructor seemed concerned if the students learned the material.	SG	5	5	2	5	0	17
	LG	4	6	5	2	0	17
5. The student was interested in learning the course material.	SG	12	4	1	0	0	17
	LG	8	8	1	0	0	17
6. The student was generally attentive in class.	SG	10	6	0	0	1	17
	LG	4	9	3	1	0	17
7. The student felt the course was an intellectual challenge.	SG	7	6	2	1	1	17
	LG	2	3	2	6	4	17
8. The student became more competent in this area due to the course.	SG	12	3	1	1	0	17
	LG	3	8	2	3	1	17
9. The instructor encouraged students to express their opinions.	SG	6	6	4	1	0	17
	LG	4	6	5	2	0	17
10. The instructor was receptive to new ideas and other's viewpoints.	SG	5	5	5	2	0	17
	LG	2	5	3	6	1	17
11. The student had an opportunity to ask questions.	SG	10	7	0	0	0	17
	LG	6	10	1	0	0	17
12. The instructor generally stimulated class discussion.	SG	5	6	4	1	0	16
	LG	3	6	5	3	0	17
13. The instructor attempted to cover too much class material.	SG	3	2	3	8	0	16
	LG	1	1	3	8	4	17
14. The instructor generally presented the material too rapidly.	SG	1	2	4	7	2	16
	LG	0	1	4	7	4	16

		A	B	C	D	E	Tot
15. The homework was too time consuming relative to value of course.	SG	4	5	4	3	0	16
	LG	0	1	8	5	3	17
16. The student generally found the text's coverage of topics too difficult.	SG	0	0	2	8	5	15
	LG	0	0	8	3	6	17
17. The instructor appeared to relate the course concepts in a systematic manner.	SG	2	2	12	1	0	17
	LG	1	5	6	2	3	17
18. The course was well organized.	SG	4	7	6	0	0	17
	LG	0	4	3	6	4	17
19. The instructor's presentations made for easy note-taking.	SG	0	4	6	5	1	16
	LG	2	5	5	3	2	17
20. The direction of the course was adequately outlined.	SG	6	8	2	0	0	16
	LG	2	4	4	6	1	17
21. The student generally enjoyed going to class.	SG	4	8	4	0	1	17
	LG	2	5	2	6	2	17

PR 415 Questionnaire

This questionnaire seeks to evaluate PR 415 (Advanced Public Relations) at the University of Florida in term of meeting its objectives and in meeting your perceived needs as a future PR practitioner.

The following items seek to determine your agreement with a number of statements. Read each question carefully. It is highly unlikely that you will agree or disagree with all of the statements listed. The scale is as follows: (a) strongly agree (b) mildly agree (c) neutral (d) mildly disagree (e) strongly disagree. Circle desired answer. (Note: SG = "small-group" class; LG = "large-group" class.)

Item		A	B	C	D	E	Tot
1. PR 415 was helpful to me in understanding how to define a problem, set goals and objectives, and select a means to attain those objectives.	SG	10	8	2	1	0	21
	LG	5	13	2	1	0	21
2. PR 415 failed to expand my knowledge and understanding of basic PR principles.	SG	0	2	2	3	14	21
	LG	1	1	6	3	10	21
3. PR 415 was helpful to me in understanding the value of assigning responsibilities and setting up a time-table for work to be done.	SG	11	6	2	0	2	21
	LG	6	12	2	0	0	20
4. PR 415 helped me to sharpen practical skills useful to the PR professional.	SG	10	10	1	0	0	21
	LG	5	13	1	2	0	21
5. I was not assigned an important role in carrying out a PR campaign.	SG	0	1	1	3	16	21
	LG	0	3	4	4	10	21
6. I was totally frustrated by this course.	SG	0	3	7	6	5	21
	LG	2	1	7	4	7	21
7. My ideas were not accepted in planning and implementing the PR campaign.	SG	0	1	4	7	9	21
	LG	0	0	4	8	9	21
8. I favor working in small, four-member teams in a PR campaign rather than in an entire-class project.	SG	14	5	2	0	0	21
	LG	0	4	5	6	6	21
9. I favor working on a PR campaign alone, not involving other class members.	SG	8	0	3	9	1	21
	LG	2	1	4	6	8	21

		A	B	C	D	E	Tot
10. I do not believe that this course added to my understanding of how effective communication can help achieve success in meeting an objective.	SG	0	2	2	6	11	21
	LG	0	2	5	8	6	21
11. I think the interchange brought about by the entire class working together on a term-long project is helpful to this course.	SG	2	6	9	3	1	21
	LG	8	7	3	1	2	21

The following questions are based on the degree to which you believe PR 415 prepared you to perform functions normally expected of PR practitioners. In this case, respond to the questions on the basis of the following scale: (a) Excellent preparation (b) fair preparation (c) neutral (d) inadequate preparation (e) virtually no preparation.

Item		A	B	C	D	E	Tot
12. To what degree was the case study textbook helpful to me as future PR practitioner?	SG	2	10	6	3	0	21
	LG	0	12	4	3	2	21
13. To what degree do I find highly structured experiences valuable to me in PR training?	SG	7	6	6	1	1	21
	LG	6	11	3	1	0	21
14. How did I find the role of the professor to be in helping me learn what I need to know to function as a PR practitioner?	SG	4	6	6	4	1	21
	LG	3	8	4	2	4	21
15. To what degree do I find freedom to innovate and develop own ideas important to my PR training?	SG	11	7	2	1	0	21
	LG	11	5	5	0	0	21

This continues questions based on the degree to which you perceive PR 415 to be helpful to you as a future PR practitioner. The scale is as follows: (a) Excellent preparation (b) fair preparation (c) neutral (d) inadequate preparation (e) virtually no preparation.

How do I evaluate the following assignments as preparation for a PR practitioner:

16. --Case study presentation to class members	SG	7	6	3	2	2	NA
	LG	2	6	4	2	7	21
17. --Special event planning & implementation	SG	13	6	1	1	0	21
	LG	17	4	0	0	0	21

		A	B	C	D	E	Tot
18. --Team effort for client	SG	12	5	3	1	0	21
	LG	13	8	0	0	0	21
19. --Hometown press release	SG	15	10	2	3	1	21
	LG	11	6	2	1	1	21

To what degree did I find PR 415 helped me to work with the following channels of communications:

20. --audio-visual presentations	SG	4	15	2	0	0	21
	LG	1	5	6	4	5	21
21. --use of print news media	SG	10	9	2	0	0	21
	LG	7	8	6	0	0	21
22. --speaking before groups	SG	14	5	1	1	0	21
	LG	7	10	3	0	1	21
23. --use of electronic media	SG	3	8	6	3	1	21
	LG	1	3	7	4	6	21
24. --use of posters, fliers	SG	14	5	2	0	0	21
	LG	3	7	9	1	1	21
25. --use of face-to-face contact	SG	13	5	2	0	0	20
	LG	10	7	1	2	1	21
26. --preparing presentation booklet	SG	8	8	1	1	2	20
	LG	4	6	6	2	3	21
27. --use of direct mail	SG	1	6	7	3	2	19
	LG	1	6	7	3	4	21
28. --use of publications (booklets, magazines)	SG	1	4	10	4	1	20
	LG	4	7	5	3	2	21
29. --planning oral presentations	SG	13	5	3	0	0	21
	LG	6	13	2	0	0	21

What was the most rewarding experience of this course?

Were there any difficulties in this course which I feel served a useful purpose? If so, what were they?

What did I like least about participating in this course?

To what degree did this course prepare me to know what it is actually like to be a PR practitioner?